

10/051,326
Page 5

REMARKS

The above listed claim amendments along with the following remarks are fully responsive to the Office Action set forth above. Claims 1-26 are pending. Claims 1, 10, 14, 15, 21, 22 and 24 have been amended and claims 4, 5 and 6 have been cancelled.

Claims 4-6, 10, 14, 15, 20-22, 25 and 26 were objected to, and indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Response to Claim Rejection – 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-3, 7-9, 11-13, 16-19 and 23 were rejected as unpatentable under 35 USC 102(a) in view of the hypothetical combination of Krenzin and Ander. The remarks as to the hypothetical combination of these references in the Amendment filed November 13, 2003 are incorporated herein by reference. Nevertheless, to advance prosecution of this application, applicants have amended the single independent claim in this application to incorporate the subject matter of claim 4 which was indicated as allowable in the Office Action, paper no. 7.

Claim 1 has been rewritten to include previously presented claim 4. In addition, claim 1 has been amended to now recite that the driving wheel is "in contact with a floor or ground" in line 2 (to broaden the claim to include "ground" and to provide antecedent basis for later reference in the claim), and the reference to "the floor" in line 4 has been amended to "the floor or ground." No new matter is introduced, since the specification, at page 2, line 13 and at page 5, line 7 refers to "the floor or ground."

Claims 4, 5, and 6 have been cancelled, and the dependency of claims previously depending from any of these claims have been amended. All of the claims pending after entry of this amendment depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1; according all presently pending claims are allowable for the reasons with respect to claims 1 and 4.

Claims 7-10 are also allowable because the hypothetical combination of references does not teach or suggest that the vehicle travelling speed is determined from the number of revolutions of at least one non-driven wheel (10, 12) of the industrial truck.

Claims 11-15 are also allowable because the hypothetical combination of references does not teach or suggest that the speed is measured on two non-driven wheels (10, 12) in

10/051,326
Page 6

order to determine a reference speed on the driving wheel (14) as a vector quantity direction and magnitude from the vehicle geometry.

Claims 16 is also allowable because the hypothetical combination of references does not teach or suggest that a calculation of a circumferential component and/or an axial component of the reference speed is performed by measuring a steering angle on the driving wheel (14).

Claims 17-23 are also allowable because the hypothetical combination of references does not teach or suggest the desired slip for a certain friction pairing is constituted by an optimum slip value.

Claims 24 is also allowable because the hypothetical combination of references does not teach or suggest that a desired slip is determined while the industrial truck is in operation.

Claims 25 and 26 are also allowable because the hypothetical combination of references does not teach or suggest that an axial speed component is determined from the reference speed of the driving wheel (14) and the steering angle is limited or reduced if the axial speed component exceeds a preset point.

10/051,326
Page 7

Conclusion

All pending claims are now in condition for allowance. A notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

NIS-GEORG NISSEN et al.

By: 

John M. Haurykiewicz, #29,311
FAEGRE & BENSON LLP
2200 Wells Fargo Center
90 South Seventh Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402-3901
612/766-8216

Dated: April 23, 2004

M2:20619482.01

Serial No.: 10/051,326